arXiv:1411.4226v1 [math.ST] 16 Nov 2014

Roy's largest root under rank-one alternatives: The complex valued case and applications

Prathapasinghe Dharmawansa Boaz Nadler Ofer Shwartz

November 18, 2014

The largest eigenvalue of a Wishart matrix, known as Roy's largest root (RLR), plays an important role in a variety of applications. Most works to date derived approximations to its distribution under various asymptotic regimes, such as degrees of freedom, dimension, or both tending to infinity. However, several applications involve finite and relative small parameters, for which the above approximations may be inaccurate. Recently, via a small noise perturbation approach with fixed dimension and degrees of freedom, Johnstone and Nadler derived simple yet accurate stochastic approximations to the distribution of Roy's largest root in the real valued case, under a rank-one alternative. In this paper, we extend their results to the complex valued case. Furthermore, we analyze the behavior of the leading eigenvector by developing new stochastic approximations. Specifically, we derive simple stochastic approximations to the distribution of the largest eigenvalue under five common complex single-matrix and double-matrix scenarios. We then apply these results to investigate several problems in signal detection and communications. In particular, we analyze the performance of RLR detector in cognitive radio spectrum sensing and constant-modulus signal detection in the high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) regime. Moreover, we address the problem of determining the optimal transmit-receive antenna configuration (here optimality is in the sense of outage minimization) for rank-one multiple-input and multiple-output Rician-Fading channels at high SNR.

1. Introduction

Let H, E be two independent complex-valued Wishart matrices, where $E \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_E, \Sigma_E)$ and H is either central or non-central Wishart, namely $H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, \Sigma_H)$ or $H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, \Sigma_H, \Omega)$, respectively. We denote the largest eigenvalue of H by $\ell_1(H)$ and similarly, the largest eigenvalue of $E^{-1}H$ by $\ell_1(E^{-1}H)$. These largest eigenvalues, either in the single matrix case or in the double matrix case, are central quantities of interest in many applications, specifically in signal detection and communications. More generally, these eigenvalues, also known as Roy's largest roots, play a key role in hypothesis testing problems.

Obtaining simple expressions, exact or approximate, for the distribution of ℓ_1 in the single or double matrix case has been a subject of intense research for over more than 50 years. An exact expression for the distribution of ℓ_1, in the single central matrix case with an identity covariance matrix ($\Sigma_H = I$), was first presented by Khatri [1]. This result was generalized to various other settings, such as an arbitrary covariance matrix or a non-centrality matrix [2, 3, 4]. The resulting expressions are, in general, challenging to evaluate numerically. More recently, Zanella *et al.* [5] presented simpler exact expressions, both for the central case with arbitrary Σ_H, as well as the noncentral case but with $\Sigma_H = I$, that are easier to evaluate, though still require a recursive algorithm.

A different approach to derive approximate distributions for the largest eigenvalue in the null case, where $\Sigma_E = \Sigma_H = I$, is based on random matrix theory. Considering the limit as n_H and m (and in the double matrix case also n_E) tend to infinity, with their ratios kept fixed, ℓ_1 in the single matrix case, and $\log(\ell_1)$ in the double matrix case, asymptotically follow a Tracy-Widom distribution [6, 7, 8]. Furthermore, with suitable centering and scaling coefficients, the convergence to these limiting distributions can be quite fast [9, 10].

In this paper we focus on the distribution of ℓ_1 under a rank-one alternative with complex valued observations, namely when $\Sigma_H = I + \lambda \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger$ in the central case, or $\Omega = \lambda \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger$ in the non-central case, where $\mathbf{v}^\dagger$ denotes the conjugate transpose of $\mathbf{v}$. One classical result in the single-matrix case, is that asymptotically as $n_H \to \infty$ with fixed dimension m, $\ell_1(H)$ asymptotically follows a Gaussian distribution [11]. Recently, Paul [12] proved that in the random matrix setting, as both n_H and m tend to infinity with their ratio fixed, if $\lambda > \sqrt{m/n_H}$ then $\ell_1(H)$ still converges to a Gaussian distribution. In the double-matrix case, the location of the phase transition and the limiting value of $\ell_1(E^{-1}H)$ were recently studied by Nadakuditi and Silverstein [13]. Moreover, in a very recent development, the authors in [14] have proved that, above the phase transition, $\ell_1(E^{-1}H)$ converges to a Gaussian distribution.

Whereas the above results assume that dimension and degrees of freedom tend to infinity, in various common applications these quantities are not only finite but typically relatively small. In such settings, the above asymptotic results may yield poor approximations to the distribution of the largest eigenvalue ℓ_1, which may be quite far from Gaussian (see Figure 3 for an illustrative example). Recently, using a small noise perturbation approach, Johnstone and Nadler [15] derived approximations to the distribution of ℓ_1, both for single and double real-valued Wishart matrices with finite dimension and degrees of freedom. In this paper, we build upon their work and extend their results to the complex valued case. Propositions 1-5 of Section 2 provide approximate expressions for the distribution of ℓ_1 corresponding to the five common single-matrix and double-matrix cases outlined in Table 1. Furthermore, in section 3 we study the fluctuations in the leading *eigenvector*, in particular its overlap with the population eigenvector.

Next, in section 4, we illustrate the utility of these approximations in several applications in signal detection and communication. For signal detection, we use propositions 1-4 to provide simple approximate expressions for the power of Roy's largest root test under two common signal models. Next, we consider the outage probability in a multiple-

Case	Distribution	Testing Problem, Application
1	$H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, \Sigma + \lambda \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger)$ Σ is known	Signal detection in noise, known noise covariance matrix.
2	$H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, \Sigma, \frac{\omega}{\det(\Sigma)}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger)$ Σ is known	Constant modulus signal detection in noise, known noise covariance matrix. Outage probability of a Rician-fading MIMO channel.
3	$H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, \Sigma + \lambda \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger)$ $E \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_E, \Sigma)$	Signal detection in noise, estimated noise covariance matrix.
4	$H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, \Sigma, \frac{\omega}{\det(\Sigma)}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger)$ $E \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_E, \Sigma)$	Constant modulus signal detection in noise, estimated noise covariance matrix.
5	$H \sim \mathcal{CW}_p(q, \Phi, \Omega)$ $E \sim \mathcal{CW}_p(n-q, \Phi)$, Ω random	canonical correlation analysis between two groups of sizes $p \leq q$

Table 1: Five common single-matrix and double-matrix settings and some representative applications.

input and multiple-output (MIMO) communication system. For the particular case of a rank-one Rician fading channel, we use Proposition 2, and show *analytically* that to minimize the outage probability it is preferable to have equal number of transmitting and receiving antennas. This important design property was previously observed via simulations [3]. Finally, Section 5 provides some simulation results to verify the accuracy of the new results.

2. On the Distribution of Roy's Largest Root

Propositions 1-5 below provide simple approximations to the distribution of Roy's largest root under a rank-one alternative and several common single matrix and double matrix settings. The following 5 propositions correspond to the five cases in Table 1, and extend to the complex-valued setting propositions 1-5 of [15].

We start with the simplest setting of a single central Wishart matrix. Since in cases 1 and 2 the matrix Σ is assumed to be known, we assume w.l.g. that $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I$, where σ^2 is a small parameter, typically representing the noise variance in the absence of a signal. In contrast to previous asymptotic approaches whereby $n_H \to \infty$, $m \to \infty$ or both, in the following, we keep the number of samples n_H and the dimension m fixed, and study the distribution of the largest eigenvalue as $\sigma \to 0$. We start with the central setting, case 1 in Table 1.

Proposition 1. *Let $H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, \lambda \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)$, with $||\mathbf{v}|| = 1$, $\lambda > 0$ and let ℓ_1 be its largest eigenvalue. Then, with (m, n, λ) fixed, as $\sigma \to 0$*

$$\ell_1(\sigma) = \frac{\lambda + \sigma^2}{2} A + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} B + \frac{\sigma^4}{2(\lambda + \sigma^2)} \frac{B \cdot C}{A} + o(\sigma^4) \tag{2.1}$$

where A, B, C are independent random variables, distributed as $A \sim \chi^2_{2n}, B \sim \chi^2_{2m-2}$, and $C \sim \chi^2_{2n-2}$.

Remark 1. Approximate expressions for the mean and variance of ℓ_1 follow directly from Eq. (2.1). Since $\mathbb{E}[\chi^2_k] = k$ and for $k > 2$ $\mathbb{E}[1/\chi^2_k] = 1/(k-2)$, then for $n > 1$ as $\sigma \to 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_1(\sigma)] = n\lambda + (n+m-1)\sigma^2 + \frac{\sigma^4}{\lambda+\sigma^2}(m-1) + o(\sigma^4) \tag{2.2}$$

Similarly, since $\mathrm{Var}[\chi^2_k] = 2k$ and for $k > 4$ $\mathrm{Var}[1/\chi^2_k] = \frac{2}{(k-2)^2(k-4)}$, then for $n > 3$

$$\mathrm{Var}[\ell_1(\sigma)] = 2\left(\lambda n + \sigma^2(n+m-1) + \frac{\sigma^4}{\lambda+\sigma^2}\frac{(m-1)}{(n-1)(n-2)}\right) + o(\sigma^2) \tag{2.3}$$

The next proposition considers the non-central single Wishart matrix.

Proposition 2. *Let $H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, \sigma^2 I, (\omega/\sigma^2)\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger)$, with $||\mathbf{v}|| = 1$, and let ℓ_1 be its largest eigenvalue. Then, with (m, n, ω) fixed, as $\sigma \to 0$*

$$\ell_1(\sigma) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\left[A + B + \frac{B \cdot C}{A}\right] + o(\sigma^4) \tag{2.4}$$

where A, B, C are all independent and distributed as $A \sim \chi^2_{2n}(2\omega/\sigma^2), B \sim \chi^2_{2m-2}$ and $C \sim \chi^2_{2n-2}$.

Remark 2. By representing $\chi^2_k(\delta)$ as χ^2_{k+2K} for $K \sim Poisson(\delta/2)$, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\chi^2_k(\delta)] = k + \delta$, $\mathbb{E}[(\chi^2_k(\delta))^{-1}] \approx (n-2+\delta)^{-1}$ and $\mathrm{Var}(\chi^2_k(\delta))^{-1} \approx \frac{2}{(k+\delta-2)^2(k+\delta-4)}$. Therefore, assuming $n > 2$, we can approximate the expectation and the variance of (2.4) by

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_1(\sigma)] \approx (n+m-1)\sigma^2 + \omega + \frac{(n-1)(m-1)}{\sigma^2(n-1)+\omega} \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Var}[\ell_1(\sigma)] \approx 8\omega + 4\sigma^2\left(n+m-1+\frac{(n-1)(m-1)}{2(n+\frac{\sigma^2}{\omega}-1)^2(n+\frac{\sigma^2}{\omega}-2)}\right) \tag{2.6}$$

Remark 3. In both Eqs. (2.1) and (2.4), note that as $n \to \infty$, the χ^2 random variables converge to Gaussian ones, and thus asymptotically the distribution of ℓ_1 converges to a Gaussian as well. This is in accordance with classical asymptotic results, see [11].

The next two propositions provide approximations to the distribution of Roy's largest root in the central and non-central double matrix settings, which correspond to cases 3 and 4 in Table 1. Since $\ell^{-1}(E^{-1}H) = \ell^{-1}((\Sigma^{-1}E)^{-1}(\Sigma^{-1}H))$, we can assume w.l.g. that $\Sigma = I$.

Proposition 3. *Suppose that* $H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, I + \lambda \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger)$ *and* $E \sim CW_m(n_E, I)$ *are independent complex Wishart matrices, with* $n_E > m + 1$ *and* $||\mathbf{v}|| = 1$. *Let* ℓ_1 *be the largest eigenvalue of* $E^{-1}H$. *Then, with* (m, n_H, n_E) *fixed, as* $\lambda \to \infty$

$$\ell_1(\lambda) \approx (1 + \lambda) a_1 F_{b_1,c_1} + a_2 F_{b_2,c_2} + a_3 \tag{2.7}$$

where the two F distributed random variates are independent, and

$$a_1 = \frac{n_H}{n_E - m + 1} \qquad a_2 = \frac{m-1}{n_E - m + 2} \qquad a_3 = \frac{m-1}{(n_E - m)(n_E - m - 1)} \tag{2.8}$$

$$b_1 = 2n_H \qquad b_2 = 2m - 2$$

$$c_1 = 2n_E - 2m + 2 \qquad c_2 = 2n_E - 2m + 4$$

Proposition 4. *Suppose that* $H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, I, \omega \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger)$ *and* $E \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_E, I)$ *are independent complex Wishart matrices, with* $n_E > m + 1$, $\omega > 0$ *and* $||\mathbf{v}|| = 1$. *Let* ℓ_1 *be the largest eigenvalue of* $E^{-1}H$. *Then, with* (m, n_H, n_E) *fixed, as* $\omega \to \infty$

$$\ell_1(\omega) \approx a_1 F_{b_1,c_1}(2\omega) + a_2 F_{b_2,c_2} + a_3 \tag{2.9}$$

where the two F distributed random variates are independent and the parameters a_i, b_i, c_i *are as defined in Eq. (2.8).*

Remark 4. In the limit as $n_E \to \infty$, the two F-distributed random variables in (2.7) and (2.9) converge to χ^2 distributed random variables, thus recovering the leading order terms in (2.1) and (2.4), respectively.

2.1. On the leading canonical correlation coefficient

Let $\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Sigma)$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n+1$ denote complex valued multivariate Gaussian observations on $m = p + q$ variables, where without loss of generality we assume that $p \leq q$. Let us denote the corresponding sample covariance matrix by S. In this subsection we consider the fifth setting of Table 1 and study the largest sample canonical correlation coefficient between the first group of p variables and the second group of q variables, in the presence of a single large canonical correlation coefficient in the population.

Now, in the presence of a single large population canonical correlation coefficient, which we denote by ρ, one can decompose Σ as[1]

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} I_p & \tilde{P} \\ \tilde{P}^\dagger & I_q \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.10}$$

where $\tilde{P} = \begin{pmatrix} P & \mathbf{0}_{p \times (q-p)} \end{pmatrix}$ with $P = \mathrm{diag}(\rho, 0, \cdots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Similarly, one can decompose the sample covariance matrix as

$$nS = \begin{pmatrix} Y^\dagger Y & Y^\dagger X \\ X^\dagger Y & X^\dagger X \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.11}$$

[1]Since the canonical correlation is invariant under nonsingular linear transformations, without loss of generality, we can choose this canonical form for the matrix Σ .

where $Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times p}$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times q}$ represent the first p variables and the remaining q variables, respectively. Clearly, the sample canonical correlation coefficients, $r_1, r_2, \cdots, r_p$ are the positive square roots of the eigenvalues of $(Y^\dagger Y)^{-1}Y^\dagger X(X^\dagger X)^{-1}X^\dagger Y$. Our objective is to analyze the largest sample canonical correlation coefficient under the above setting (i.e., in the presence of a single dominant population canonical correlation coefficient). As shown below, a single dominant population canonical correlation coefficient amounts to having a rank-one non-centrality matrix.

Now we can write the squared sample canonical correlation coefficients (i.e., r_i^2) as the roots of the following characteristic equation

$$\det\left(r^2 Y^\dagger Y - Y^\dagger Q Y\right) = 0 \tag{2.12}$$

where $Q = X^\dagger \left(X^\dagger X\right)^{-1} X$. For convenience, let us introduce $H = Y^\dagger Q Y$ and $E = Y^\dagger (I_p - Q)Y$. With this notation, we obtain the modified characteristic equation as

$$\det\left(H - r^2(H+E)\right) = 0. \tag{2.13}$$

This in turn reveals that the study of the largest root of the above equation is equivalent to study of the largest root of $E^{-1}H$. This fact can be further delineated using the relation $\ell_1 = r_1^2/(1-r_1^2)$, where ℓ_1 is the largest root of $E^{-1}H$.

The following complex analog of a result given in [15] is also important in the sequel

$$Y|X \sim \mathcal{CN}\left(X\tilde{P}^\dagger, \Phi\right) \tag{2.14}$$

where $\Phi = I_p - P^2$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} H|X &\sim \mathcal{CW}_p\left(q, \Phi, \Omega\right) \\ E|X &\sim \mathcal{CW}_p\left(n-q, \Phi\right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

are independent with the non-centrality matrix given by

$$\Omega = \Phi^{-1}\tilde{P}X^\dagger X\tilde{P}^\dagger = \frac{\rho^2}{1-\rho^2}\left(X^\dagger X\right)_{11}\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^{'} = \omega\,\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^{'} \tag{2.16}$$

where $\omega = \frac{\rho^2}{1-\rho^2}\left(X^\dagger X\right)_{11}$. Since $X^\dagger X \sim \mathcal{CW}_q\left(n, I_q\right)$, we have $\left(X^\dagger X\right)_{11} \sim \frac{1}{2}\chi^2_{2n}$. The following proposition gives the distribution of the largest sample canonical correlation in the presence of a single population canonical correlation.

Proposition 5. *Let $\ell_1 = \frac{r_1^2}{1-r_1^2}$, where r_1 is the largest sample canonical correlation between two groups of size $p \le q$ computed from $n+1$ i.i.d. observations with $\nu = n-p-q > 1$. Then in the presence of a single large population correlation coefficient ρ between the two groups, asymptotically as $\rho \to 1$,*

$$\ell_1\left(E^{-1}H\right) \approx a_1 F^{\chi}_{b_1,c_1}\left(\frac{\rho^2}{1-\rho^2}, 2n\right) + a_2 F_{b_2,c_2} + a_3 \tag{2.17}$$

where

$$a_1 = q/(\nu+1), \quad a_2 = (p-1)/(\nu+2), \quad a_3 = (p-1)/\nu(\nu-1),$$
$$b_1 = 2q, \quad b_2 = 2p-2, \quad c_1 = 2(\nu+1), \quad c_2 = 2(\nu+2).$$

Here we have used the notation $F^{\chi}_{a,b}(c,n)$ to describe the following general class of probability densities

$$\frac{\chi^2_a(Z)/a}{\chi^2_b/b} \sim F^{\chi}_{a,b}(c,n) \tag{2.18}$$

where $Z \sim c\chi^2_n$ and all the chi-squared variables are independent.

Moreover, we have the following remark on the distribution of $F^{\chi}_{b_1,c_1}\left(\frac{\rho^2}{1-\rho^2}, 2n\right)$.

Remark 5. It is not difficult to show that the probability density of $X \sim F^{\chi}_{b_1,c_1}\left(\frac{\rho^2}{1-\rho^2}, 2n\right)$ is given by

$$f_X(x) = \frac{(1-\rho^2)^n}{\mathcal{B}\left(\frac{c_1}{2}, \frac{b_1}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{c_1}{b_1}\right)^{\frac{c_1}{2}} \frac{x^{\frac{b_1}{2}-1}}{\left(x+\frac{c_1}{b_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}(c_1+b_1)}} {}_2F_1\left(n, \frac{1}{2}(c_1+b_1); \frac{b_1}{2}; \frac{x\rho^2}{x+\frac{c_1}{b_1}}\right) \tag{2.19}$$

where ${}_2F_1(a,b;c;z)$ is the Gauss hypergeometric function and $\mathcal{B}(p,q)$ is the beta function.

3. On the inner product between the sample and population eigenvectors

We now consider the relation between the leading sample eigenvector and the population eigenvector. In most practical scenarios, knowledge of the exact population covariance matrix is not available and in particular $\mathbf{v}$ is unknown. Therefore, it is common to use the sample eigenvalues/eigenvectors instead of the population analogs. In such situations, key quantity of interest is the correlation between the leading sample eigenvector and its population counterpart. This correlation can be represented as follows

$$R = \frac{|\hat{\mathbf{v}}^{\dagger}\mathbf{v}|^2}{||\hat{\mathbf{v}}||^2} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ denotes the sample eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue ℓ_1.

This quantity is of considerable interest both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the large sample almost sure limits in the random matrix setting (i.e., as $m, n_H \to \infty$ such that $m/n_H \to \kappa > 0$) were derived in [12] and [16]. These results show that R does not converge to 1 (i.e.,$\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is inconsistent). For a practical application, the quantity R is of paramount importance in the design of adaptive beamformers (ABFs) in array processing. In this respect, the dominant mode rejection (DMR) ABF derives its weight vector using the eigen-decomposition of the sample covariance matrix [17].

Since one of the main purposes of the beamformers is to eliminate loud interferers coming from undesired directions other than the steering direction, the DMR ABF creates deep notches along the directions of loud interferers. As shown in [18], an important parameter which determines the depth of attenuation of the interferers is the correlation between the sample eigenvectors and unobservable population eigenvectors. Moreover, in the presence of a single dominant interferer, the population covariance matrix takes the form of a rank one spiked model (see [18, Eq. 17]). Therefore, it is important to understand the behavior of R under the rank one spiked framework.

Motivated by the above facts, in what follows we develop stochastic approximations to R in two scenarios depending on $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$. Specifically, in the first scenario, $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{CW}_m(n, \lambda\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger + \sigma^2 I_m)$ while in the second scenario it is the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{CW}_m(n, \sigma^2 I_m, (\omega/\sigma^2)\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger)$.

Now we have the following proposition in the first scenario.

Proposition 6. *Let $H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, \lambda\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger + \sigma^2 I_m)$, with $||\mathbf{v}|| = 1$ and $\lambda > 0$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ be the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of H. Then, with (m, n, λ) fixed, as $\sigma \to 0$*

$$R \approx \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda + \sigma^2}\frac{A}{B} + \frac{2\sigma^4}{(\lambda + \sigma^2)^2}\frac{AC}{B^2}} \tag{3.2}$$

where $A \sim \chi^2_{2m-2}$, $B \sim \chi^2_{2n}$, and $C \sim \chi^2_{2n-2}$ are independent random variables.

The distribution of R corresponding to the second scenario is given by the following proposition.

Proposition 7. *Let $H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, \sigma^2 I_m, (\omega/\sigma^2)\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger)$, with $||\mathbf{v}|| = 1$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ be the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of H. Then, with (m, n, ω) fixed, as $\sigma \to 0$*

$$R \approx \frac{1}{1 + \frac{A}{B_\sigma} + 2\frac{AC}{B_\sigma^2}} \tag{3.3}$$

where $A \sim \chi^2_{2m-2}$, $B_\sigma \sim \chi^2_{2n}(2\omega/\sigma^2)$, and $C \sim \chi^2_{2n-2}$ are independent random variables.

4. Applications

After establishing approximations to the distribution of Roy's largest root, we now demonstrate their utility in three different engineering applications. The first two applications are concerned with common problems in signal detection, whereas the third is concerned with the outage probability of a rank-one Rician fading MIMO channel.

4.1. Signal Detection in Spectrum Sensing

In standard multiuser communication systems, each primary user (PU) is allocated a unique frequency band of the spectrum. By design, this band may be used solely by the corresponding PU. To better utilize the available spectrum, novel cognitive radio dynamic spectrum allocation methods have been proposed in the past decade [19]. In these schemes, opportunistic secondary users (SU) are allowed to use frequency bands not allocated to them by first sensing whether these are currently in use by their PU's. Several measurement schemes and statistical tests were derived for this task, see [20],[21] and references therein.

One of the proposed test statistics, in particular when the noise level is known and the signal is assumed Gaussian, is simply the largest eigenvalue of the observed data, namely Roy's Largest Root Test (RLRT). Assuming the noise variance is small (i.e., in the high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) regime), one may then easily approximate the power of this test using Propositions 1 and 3.

Let us describe this setting in more detail. Consider a spectrum sensing system with m receiving antennas, that in a short time window samples n_H vectors $\{\mathbf{y}_j\}_{j=1}^{n_H}$, where $\mathbf{y}_j \in \mathbb{C}^m$. A common modeling assumption is that the samples are i.i.d. realizations of a random vector taking the form

$$\mathbf{y} = \sqrt{\lambda} s \mathbf{u} + \sigma \mathbf{n} \tag{4.1}$$

where $s \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^m$ is the (normalized) channel gain vector between the PU and the antennas, $||\mathbf{u}|| = 1$, $\mathbf{n}$ is an additive Gaussian noise, $\mathbf{n} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Sigma)$, and λ is the received signal power. If the PU is inactive, namely $\lambda = 0$, then all measurements are just noise. Hence, the spectrum sensing task can be formulated as the following hypothesis testing problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{H}_0 : \lambda = 0 & \text{PU is inactive} \\ \mathcal{H}_1 : \lambda > 0 & \text{PU is active.} \end{array} \tag{4.2}$$

When Σ is known (w.l.o.g. it is assumed to be of the form $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I_m$,) (4.2) yields the following hypothesis testing problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{H}_0 : & \mathbf{y}_j \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2 I_m) \\ \mathcal{H}_1 : & \mathbf{y}_j \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \lambda \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\dagger + \sigma^2 I_m). \end{array} \tag{4.3}$$

Under the alternative $\mathcal{H}_1$, the unnormalized sample covariance matrix of the n_H observations follows a complex Wishart distribution,

$$H = YY^\dagger \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, \lambda \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\dagger + \sigma^2 I_m). \tag{4.4}$$

We may then use Proposition 1 to approximate the power of Roy's largest root test, for a given threshold parameter μ, as

$$P_D = \Pr\left[\ell_1(\sigma, \lambda) > \mu | \mathcal{H}_1\right]. \tag{4.5}$$


Power of RLRT in various SNR scenarios
Known covariance matrix
$\lambda = 1, \sigma = 1$ Proposition
$\lambda = 1, \sigma = 1$ Simulation
$\lambda = 1, \sigma = 1/2$ Proposition
$\lambda = 1, \sigma = 1/2$ Simulation
$\lambda = 1, \sigma = 1/5$ Proposition
$\lambda = 1, \sigma = 1/5$ Simulation
P_D
Threshold parameter μ
Power of RLRT in various SNR scenarios
Unknown covariance matrix
$\lambda = 2, \sigma = 1$ Proposition
$\lambda = 2, \sigma = 1$ Simulation
$\lambda = 2, \sigma = 1/2$ Proposition
$\lambda = 2, \sigma = 1/2$ Simulation
$\lambda = 2, \sigma = 1/3$ Proposition
$\lambda = 2, \sigma = 1/3$ Simulation
P_D
Threshold parameter μ

Figure 1: Evaluation of RLRT power, by simulations and by our proposed approximations, for various values of SNR, as a function of the threshold μ. Clearly, as the SNR grows, the accuracy of the approximation increases.

Figure 1 demonstrates the accuracy of our approximations for several values of signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), where SNR $= \frac{\lambda}{\sigma^2}$.

Another possible scenario is when the noise covariance matrix Σ is arbitrary and unknown but we have $n_E > m+1$ i.i.d. noise only samples $\{\mathbf{z}_j\}$, generated from $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{n}$, see [22, 13]. Then we can approximate Σ by $\frac{1}{n_E}\sum_{j=1}^{n_E}\mathbf{z}_j\mathbf{z}_j^\dagger$ and whiten the sample covariance matrix. Therefore, we get

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_E}\mathbf{z}_j\mathbf{z}_j^\dagger\right)^{-1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_H}\mathbf{y}_j\mathbf{y}_j^\dagger\right) = E^{-1}H \tag{4.6}$$

where

$$E \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_E, I) \qquad H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m\left(n_H, \frac{\lambda}{\sigma^2}\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\dagger + I\right). \tag{4.7}$$

Now we can use Proposition 3 to approximate the power of the test

$$P_D = \Pr\left[\ell_1\left(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma^2}\right) > \mu | \mathcal{H}_1\right] \tag{4.8}$$

for a given threshold parameter μ.

Unlike previous analyses which heavily relied on the assumption of large number of samples or antennas, the approximations here enable us to analyze scenarios with small and fixed n_E, n_H and m. However, it is noteworthy that our approximations are very tight only for small values of σ (i.e., in the high SNR regime). Above facts are further illustrated in Fig. 1.

4.2. Constant Modulus Signal Detection

In the previous section, it was assumed that the transmitted signal s was Gaussian distributed. We now consider a different setting of constant modulus (CM) signals. Here the signal $s = e^{\imath\phi}$, where $\imath = \sqrt{-1}$, and $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ is an unknown (possibly random) time-dependent phase. One common example is the well-known FM signal [23]. As in section 4.1, given n_H measurements, the task is to decide whether they contain a CM signal, or just noise.

Formally, we assume the availability of n_H i.i.d. samples $\{\mathbf{y}_j\}_{j=1}^{n_H}$ drawn from

$$\mathbf{y} = \sqrt{\lambda}\exp(\imath\phi)\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{n}$$

where $\mathbf{n} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Sigma)$ and $\lambda > 0$ is the transmit signal power. The preceding detection problem can be formulated as the following hypothesis testing problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{H}_0 : \lambda = 0 & \text{signal is absent} \\ \mathcal{H}_1 : \lambda > 0 & \text{signal is present.} \end{array} \tag{4.9}$$

Although Roy's largest root test is not necessarily the optimal detector for the CM signals, due to its simplicity and low computational complexity, it is still a common choice. As in section 4.1, we may approximate its power using our propositions.

We assume w.l.o.g. that $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I$. Then, conditional on the n_H phases $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n_H}$, the sample covariance matrix $H = \sum_{j=1}^{n_H} \mathbf{y}_j\mathbf{y}_j^\dagger$ follows a non-central Wishart distribution,

$$H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m\left(n_H, \sigma^2 I_m, \frac{\lambda n_H}{\sigma^2}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\dagger\right).$$

Importantly, this distribution does *not* depend on the phases ϕ_j, If the noise level σ is known, then we may use Proposition 2, with $\omega = \lambda n_H$, to obtain an approximation to the power of Roy's largest root test for a given threshold parameter μ

$$P_D = \Pr\left[\ell_1(\sigma, \omega) > \mu | \mathcal{H}_1\right]. \tag{4.10}$$

If the noise covariance matrix Σ is arbitrary and unknown but we have $n_E > m + 1$ i.i.d. noise only samples $\{\mathbf{z}_j\}$, generated from $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{n}$, we can approximate Σ with $\frac{1}{n_E}\sum_{j=1}^{n_E} \mathbf{z}_j\mathbf{z}_j^\dagger$ and whiten the sample covariance matrix. As before, we assume w.l.o.g. that $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I_m$, which leads to

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_E} \mathbf{z}_j\mathbf{z}_j^\dagger\right)^{-1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_H} \mathbf{y}_j\mathbf{y}_j^\dagger\right) = E^{-1}H \tag{4.11}$$

where

$$E \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_E, I) \qquad H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, I_m, \lambda n_H \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\dagger). \tag{4.12}$$

In this case we use Proposition 4, with $\omega = \frac{\lambda n_H}{\sigma^2}$, to obtain an approximation to the power of Roy's largest root test for a given threshold parameter μ.

4.3. Rank-One Rician-Fading MIMO Channel

The last application we present involves the outage probability of a MIMO channel. Consider a general MIMO communication channel with n_T transmitters and n_R receivers. The relation between the transmitted signal $\mathbf{x}$ and the received signal $\mathbf{y}$ is assumed to be of the form

$$\mathbf{y} = H\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n} \tag{4.13}$$

where H is the channel matrix of size $n_R \times n_T$ and $\mathbf{n}$ is a complex Gaussian noise with zero mean and covariance matrix $\sigma_n^2 I_{n_R}$. Under a common fading model, known as Rican fading [24], the matrix H takes the form

$$H = \sqrt{\frac{K}{K+1}} H_1 + \sqrt{\frac{1}{K+1}} H_2$$

where the parameter K and the two matrices H_1, H_2 characterize the channel. The matrix H_1 represents the specular (Rician) component that typically results from a direct line-of-sight between transmitter and receiver antennas. The matrix H_2 represents the scattered Rayleigh-fading component which is random. Assuming fixed sender and receiver locations, the matrix H_1 is constant, whereas the random matrix H_2 is typically modeled as i.i.d. complex Gaussians with zero mean and variance σ_H^2. In this setting, the parameter K (a.k.a. the Rician factor) represents the ratio of deterministic-to-scattered power of the environment. Moreover, we make the common assumption that $\mathrm{tr}^2(HH^\dagger) = n_R \times n_T$.

The SNR μ of this channel, under the maximal ratio transmission strategy[2], is given by [3]

$$\mu = \frac{\Omega_D}{\sigma_n^2} \lambda_{\max} \tag{4.14}$$

where $\Omega_D = ||\mathbf{x}||^2$ is the power of the transmitted vector and $\lambda_{\max}$ is the largest eigenvalue of $HH^\dagger$. An important quantity, which characterizes the channel, is the outage probability. The outage probability is defined as the probability of failing to achieve a specified minimal SNR threshold $\mu_{\min}$ required for satisfactory reception. Following Eq. (4.14), the outage probability P_{out} can be written as

$$P_{\text{out}} = \Pr\left(\frac{\Omega_D}{\sigma_n^2} \lambda_{\max} \leq \mu_{\min} \right). \tag{4.15}$$

One particularly interesting case is when the Ricean component H_1 is assumed to be of rank one, $H_1 = \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\dagger$, where $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_R}$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_T}$. In this case, an important design question is which antennas configuration minimizes Eq. (4.15), under the constraint that the sum of the number of transmitting and receiving antennas is fixed. In this respect, via simulations, [3] showed that the most preferable configuration is to have

[2]Under this strategy, the transmitter transmits information along the leading eigenvector of $H^\dagger H$.

equal number of transmitting and receiving antennas. Here we analytically prove this result using the main approximations of this article, under the assumption of small noise (i.e., in the high SNR regime).

Claim 1. *Consider a rank-one Rician fading channel with a fixel total number of antennas, $n_T + n_R = N$. Then, for $\sigma_H \ll 1$, the setting $n_T = n_R = N/2$ for N even (or say $n_T = \lfloor N/2 \rfloor, n_R = \lceil N/2 \rceil$ for N odd) minimizes the outage probability.*

Proof. Notice that the j-th column of H is distributed as $\mathcal{CN}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K}{K+1}}\mathbf{u}_j\mathbf{v}, \frac{1}{K+1}\sigma_H^2\right)$ and therefore $HH^\dagger$ is distributed as a non-central complex Wishart matrix

$$HH^\dagger \sim \mathcal{CW}_{n_R}(n_T, \alpha^2 I, \beta^2/\alpha^2 \mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}^\dagger) \tag{4.16}$$

where $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v}/||\mathbf{v}||, \alpha^2 = \frac{1}{K+1}\sigma_H^2$ and $\beta^2 = \frac{K}{K+1}||\mathbf{u}||^2||\mathbf{v}||^2 = \frac{K}{K+1}n_R n_T$.

Thus, the matrix $HH^\dagger$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 2. Hence, for fixed (n_T, n_R, K), as $\sigma_H \to 0$

$$\mu = \frac{\Omega_D}{\sigma_n^2}\lambda_{max} = C_1\left(X_1 + X_2 + \frac{X_2 X_3}{X_1}\right) + o(\sigma_H^4) \tag{4.17}$$

where the three random variables X_1, X_2, X_3 are independent with the following distributions

$$X_1 \sim \chi^2_{2n_T}(C_2), \qquad X_2 \sim \chi^2_{2n_R-2}, \qquad X_3 \sim \chi^2_{2n_T-2}$$

with

$$C_1 = \frac{\Omega_D \sigma_H^2}{2(K+1)\sigma_n^2}, \qquad C_2 = \frac{2\beta^2}{\alpha^2} = \frac{2n_R n_T K}{\sigma_H^2}. \tag{4.18}$$

Since Eq. (4.17) is accurate for small values of σ_H, we conclude that $C_2 \gg 1$. Therefore, we may neglect the third term and the remainder terms in Eq. (4.17) to obtain

$$\mu \approx C_1\left(X_1 + X_2\right) = C_1(\chi^2_{2n_T}(C_2) + \chi^2_{2n_R-2}). \tag{4.19}$$

Since X_1 and X_2 are independent, we conclude that $X_1 + X_2 \sim \chi^2_{2n_T+2n_R-2}(C_2)$. Thus,

$$\mu \propto \chi^2_{2N-2}(C_2).$$

Clearly P_{out} is minimal when the non-centrality parameter C_2 is maximal. Since by Eq. (4.18) the parameter $C_2 \propto n_T \cdot n_R$, the claim follows. □

5. Simulations

Here we assess the accuracy of our proposed approximation by a series of simulations. We calculate the empirical distribution of the largest eigenvalue using Mont Carlo realizations and compare it to our Propositions. Results for cases 1 and 2 are shown in



Figure 2: The outage probability as a function of n_T, where $n_T + n_R$ is fixed. The circles represent a Monte-Carlo simulation whereas the solid line is our approximation (which can be computed for any non-integer $n_T \in \mathbb{R}^+$). These graphs not only support Claim 1, but also demonstrate the accuracy of our approximations. In both graphs, $K = 2, \sigma_H = 0.3, \sigma_n = 1$ and $\Omega_D = 5$.

Figure 3, where for comparison, we also plot the standard Gaussian density. Results for cases 3 and 4 are shown in Figure 4. As we can see, in all cases, for small sample size and dimension, the distribution of the largest root deviates significantly from the asymptotic Gaussian one, with our propositions being able to capture this key factor.

Figure 5 shows the accuracy of Proposition 5. A good match between the theoretical approximate result and simulation results is clearly visible, particularly, at the tail of the distribution. The proposed simple stochastic characterization of the inner product between the leading sample and population eigenvectors is corroborated by the simulation results given in Figure 6.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by NIH grant NIH BIB R01EB1988 (PD) and BSF 2012-159 (PD, BN, OS).

A. Proofs

To prove Prop. 1 and 2, we first present an auxiliary lemma, whose proof is provided later on in appendix B.

Lemma 1. *Let* $\{\mathbf{x}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ *be* n *vectors in* $\mathbb{C}^m$ *of the form*

$$\mathbf{x}_j = u_j \mathbf{e}_1 + \epsilon \xi_j^{\perp} \tag{A.1}$$

with vectors $\xi_j^{\perp} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \xi_j \end{pmatrix}$, $\xi_j \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$. *Define a scalar* $z \in \mathbb{R}$, *a vector* $b \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$ *and a*


Density of ℓ_1 in Proposition 1
$n = 5, m = 5, \lambda = 5, \sigma = 0.1$
Simulation
Proposition
Gaussian
$(\ell_1 - E[\ell_1])/\sqrt{Var[\ell_1]}$
Density of ℓ_1 in Proposition 2
$n = 5, m = 3, \omega = 0.2, \sigma = 0.1$
Simulation
Proposition
Gaussian
$(\ell_1 - E[\ell_1])/\sqrt{Var[\ell_1]}$

Figure 3: Density functions of the largest eigenvalue in cases 1 and 2.


Density of ℓ_1 in Proposition 3
$n_E = 10, n_H = 10, m = 5, \lambda = 50$
Simulation
Proposition
$(\ell_1 - E[\ell_1])/\sqrt{Var[\ell_1]}$
Density of ℓ_1 in Proposition 4
$n_E = 10, n_H = 10, m = 5, \omega = 150$
Simulation
Proposition
$(\ell_1 - E[\ell_1])/\sqrt{Var[\ell_1]}$

Figure 4: Density functions of the largest eigenvalues in scenarios 3 and 4.

matrix $Z \in \mathbb{C}^{(m-1)\times(m-1)}$ *as follows:*

$$z = \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_j \overline{u_j}, \quad b = z^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \overline{u_j} \xi_j, \quad Z = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \xi_j \xi_j^{\dagger}. \tag{A.2}$$

Finally, let $\ell_1(\epsilon)$ *be the largest eigenvalue of* $H(\epsilon) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j{}^{\dagger}$. *Then* $\ell_1(\epsilon)$ *is an even analytic function of* ϵ *and its Taylor expansion around* $\epsilon = 0$ *is*

$$\ell_1(\epsilon) = z + b^{\dagger} b \epsilon^2 + z^{-1} b^{\dagger} (Z - b b^{\dagger}) b \epsilon^4 + \dots \tag{A.3}$$

Proof of Prop. 1 and 2. First, note that the eigenvalues of H are invariant under unitary transformations. Hence, w.l.g. we can assume that $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{e}_1$. Thus the matrix H may be realized from n i.i.d. observations of the form (A.1) with ϵ replaced by σ,

$$\xi_j \sim CN(0, I_{m-1}), \qquad u_j \sim \begin{cases} CN(0, \sigma^2 + \lambda) & \text{Prop. 1} \\ CN(\mu_j, \sigma^2) & \text{Prop. 2} \end{cases} \tag{A.4}$$



Figure 5: Density function of $\ell_1(E^{-1}H)$

and μ_j are arbitrary complex numbers satisfying $\sum |\mu_j|^2 = \omega$.

Lemma 1 yields the series approximation (A.3) for each realization of $u = (u_k)$ and $\Xi = [\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n] \in \mathbb{C}^{(m-1)\times n}$. To see the implications of the distributional assumptions (A.4), we first rewrite (A.3) as follows. Define $o_1 = \overline{u}/||u|| \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and then choose columns $o_2, \ldots, o_n$ so that $O = [o_1, \ldots, o_n]$ is an $n \times n$ unitary matrix. Let $V = \Xi O$ denote the $(m-1) \times n$ matrix, whose first column satisfies $v_1 = \Xi\overline{u}/||u|| = b$. In this notation, the $O(\epsilon^2)$ term in Eq. (A.3) can be written as $b^\dagger b = ||v_1||^2$. For the forth order term, observe that $Z = \Xi\Xi^\dagger = VV^\dagger$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} D = b^\dagger(Z - bb^\dagger)b &= v_1^\dagger(VV^\dagger - v_1v_1^\dagger)v_1 = (v_1^\dagger V)(v_1^\dagger V)^\dagger - (v_1^\dagger v_1)(v_1^\dagger v_1)^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{j=2}^{n} |v_1^\dagger v_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, Eq. (A.3) becomes

$$\ell_1(\epsilon) = V_0 + V_2\epsilon^2 + V_4\epsilon^4 + \ldots$$

where

$$V_0 = ||u||^2, \qquad V_2 = ||v_1||^2, \qquad V_4 = V_0^{-1}D.$$

Now, we bring in the distributional assumptions (A.4) in order to study the distributions of V_0, V_2, V_4.

Observe that $u_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}a_j + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}b_j$, where

$$a_j \sim \begin{cases} N(0, \lambda + \sigma^2) & \text{Prop. 1} \\ N(\sqrt{2}Real(\mu_j), \sigma^2) & \text{Prop. 2} \end{cases} \qquad b_j \sim \begin{cases} N(0, \lambda + \sigma^2) & \text{Prop. 1} \\ N(\sqrt{2}Im(\mu_j), \sigma^2) & \text{Prop. 2} \end{cases}$$


Density of R in Proposition 6
$m = 5$, $n = 5$, $\lambda = 5$, $\sigma = 0.1$
Simulation
Proposition
$(r - E[r])/\sqrt{Var[r]}$
Density of R in Proposition 7
$m = 3$, $n = 5$, $\sigma = 0.1$, $\omega = 5$
Simulation
Proposition
$(r - E[r])/\sqrt{Var[r]}$

Figure 6: Density functions of R corresponding to scenarios 1 and 2.

so $||u||^2 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(a_j^2 + b_j^2)$ is a sum of $2n$ independent squares of Gaussian random variables, and therefore

$$V_0 = ||u||^2 \sim \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma^2+\lambda}{2}\chi^2_{2n} & \text{Prop. 1} \\ \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\chi^2_{2n}(\frac{2\omega}{\sigma^2}) & \text{Prop. 2.} \end{cases}$$

Since O is unitary and fixed once u is given, the columns $v_j|u \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I_{m-1})$. The distribution of v_j does not depend of u, hence $v_j \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I_{m-1})$. Applying the same arguments as before

$$V_2 = ||v_1||^2 \sim \frac{1}{2}\chi^2_{2m-2}$$

independently of $||u||^2$.

Finally, conditioned on (u, v_1), we have $v_1^\dagger v_j \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, ||v_1||^2)$ and $|v_1^\dagger v_j|^2 \sim \frac{||v_1||^2}{2}\chi^2_2$. Again, applying the same arguments as before,

$$D|(u, v_1) = \sum_{j=2}^{n} |v_1^\dagger v_j|^2 |(u, v_1) \sim \frac{||v_1||^2}{2}\chi^2_{2n-2}$$

where the χ^2_{2n-2} variate is independent of (u, v_1).

We conclude that

$$V_4 \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\sigma^2+2\lambda}(\chi^2_{2n})^{-1}\chi^2_{2m-2}\chi^2_{2n-2} & \text{Prop. 1} \\ \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(\chi^2_{2n}(\frac{2\omega}{\sigma^2}))^{-1}\chi^2_{2m-2}\chi^2_{2n-2} & \text{Prop. 2} \end{cases}$$

and this completes the proof of Propositions 1 and 2. □

To prove Propositions 3 and 4, we first introduce some additional notation and two auxiliary lemmas, whose proofs are provided later on in appendix B. For a matrix S, denote by S_{jk} and S^{jk} the (j,k)-th entry of S or S^{-1}, respectively.

Lemma 2. *Let $E \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, I)$ and $M = [\mathbf{e}_1, b] \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times 2}$, with $b \perp \mathbf{e}_1$ fixed. Then*

$$S = (M^\dagger E^{-1} M)^{-1} \sim CW_2(n-m+2, D), \qquad D = diag(1, \frac{1}{||b||^2}) \tag{A.5}$$

and the two random variables S^{11} and S_{22} are independent with

$$S^{11} \sim \frac{2}{\chi^2_{2n-2m+2}}, \qquad S_{22} \sim \frac{\chi^2_{2n-2m+4}}{2||b||^2}. \tag{A.6}$$

Lemma 3. *Let $E \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, I)$ and let $A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z \end{pmatrix}$ where Z is a $(m-1)\times(m-1)$ random matrix independent of E, with $\mathbb{E}[Z] = I_{m-1}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1} A_2 E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1}{E^{11}}\right] = \frac{m-1}{(n-m)(n-m+1)}. \tag{A.7}$$

Proof of Prop. 3 and 4. Without loss of generality we may assume that the signal direction is $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{e}_1$. Hence

$$H \sim \begin{cases} \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, I_m + \lambda \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^T) & \text{Prop. 3} \\ \mathcal{CW}_m(n_H, I_m, \omega \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^T) & \text{Prop. 4.} \end{cases}$$

Next, we apply a perturbation approach similar to the one used in the previous proof. To introduce a small parameter, set

$$\epsilon^2 = \begin{cases} 1/(1+\lambda) & \text{Prop. 3} \\ 1/\omega & \text{Prop. 4.} \end{cases}$$

The matrix $H_\epsilon = \epsilon^2 H$ has a representation of the form $X^\dagger X$ with $X = [\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{n_H}]$ where $\mathbf{x}_j$ are of the form (A.1) but now with

$$\xi_j \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I_{m-1}), \qquad u_i \sim \begin{cases} \mathcal{CN}(0,1) & \text{Prop. 3} \\ \mathcal{CN}(\mu_j/\sqrt{\omega}, 1/\omega) & \text{Prop. 4} \end{cases} \tag{A.8}$$

where $\sum |\mu_j|^2 = \omega$. In particular,

$$z = \sum_{j=1}^{n_H} |u_j|^2 \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\chi^2_{2n_H} & \text{Prop. 3} \\ \frac{1}{2\omega}\chi^2_{2n_H}(2\omega) & \text{Prop. 4.} \end{cases} \tag{A.9}$$

With b as in (A.2), using the same arguments as in the previous proof, we have that $b \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I_{m-1})$, independently of u.

The matrix H_ϵ has a decomposition in the form $H_\epsilon = A_0 + \epsilon A_1 + \epsilon^2 A_2$, where

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & 0_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad A_1 = \sqrt{z} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b^\dagger \\ b & 0_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z \end{pmatrix}.$$

with Z as in (A.2).

For future use we define the following quantities

$$E^{11} = \mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1, \qquad E^{b1} = \hat{b}^\dagger E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1, \qquad E^{bb} = \hat{b}^\dagger E^{-1} \hat{b} \tag{A.10}$$

where $\hat{b} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ b \end{pmatrix}$. Note that the condition $n_E > m$ ensures that E is invertible with probability 1.

Since $E^{-1/2} H_\epsilon E^{-1/2}$ is Hermitian for all ϵ, the largest eigenvalue $\ell_1(\epsilon)$ is real-valued. Furthermore, since $E^{-1/2} H_\epsilon E^{-1/2}$ is an holomorphic symmetric function of ϵ, it follows from Kato ([25], Theorem 6.1 page 120) that the largest eigenvalue ℓ_1 and its eigenprojection $P'(\epsilon)$ are analytic functions of ϵ in some neighbourhood of zero. The eigenvalues of $E^{-1} H_\epsilon$ are the same as those of the matrix $E^{-1/2} H_\epsilon E^{-1/2}$, therefore the largest eigenvalue of $E^{-1} H_\epsilon$ is also an analytic function of ϵ. The projection to the corresponding eigenspace of $E^{-1} H_\epsilon$ is $P(\epsilon) = E^{-1/2} P'(\epsilon)$. Since the matrix E does not depend on ϵ, this projection is also an analytic function in some neighborhood of zero.

For $\epsilon = 0$, $E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1$ is an eigenvector with eigenvalue $E^{11} z$, that is,

$$E^{-1} H_0 E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1 = z E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1 = z E^{11} E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1$$

. Hence,

$$\langle P(0) E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle = \langle E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle = E^{11}. \tag{A.11}$$

Since P is an analytic function of ϵ and the inner product is a smooth function, then $\langle P(\epsilon) E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle$ is an analytic non-zero function in some neighborhood of $\epsilon = 0$. Thus, we may define

$$v_1(\epsilon) = E^{11} \langle P(\epsilon) E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle^{-1} P(\epsilon) E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1 \tag{A.12}$$

Clearly $v_1(\epsilon)$ is an eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue $\ell_1(\epsilon)$ and it is also analytic in some neighbourhood of zero. We thus expand

$$\ell_1(\epsilon) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j \epsilon^j, \qquad v_1(\epsilon) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} w_j \epsilon^j. \tag{A.13}$$

Inserting these expansions into the eigenvalue-eigenvector equations $E^{-1} H_\epsilon v_1 = \ell_1 v_1$, we get the following equations: At the $O(1)$ level,

$$E^{-1} A_0 w_0 = \lambda_0 w_0 \tag{A.14}$$

whose solution is

$$\lambda_0 = z E^{11}, \qquad w_0 = const \cdot E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1. \tag{A.15}$$

Using equations (A.11)-(A.12), we conclude that $w_0 = v_1(0) = E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1$, meaning the normalization constant is one.

From Eq. (A.12) it follows that $\mathbf{e}_1^T v_1(\epsilon) = E^{11} = \mathbf{e}_1^T w_0$. Hence $\mathbf{e}_1^T w_j = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$. Furthermore, since $A_0 = z\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^T$, this normalization also conveniently gives us that $A_0 w_j = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$.
The $O(\epsilon)$ equation is

$$E^{-1}A_1 w_0 + E^{-1}A_0 w_1 = \lambda_1 w_0 + \lambda_0 w_1. \tag{A.16}$$

However, $A_0 w_1 = 0$. Multiplying this equation by $\mathbf{e}_1^T$ gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1 &= \frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1} w_0}{E^{11}} = \frac{\sqrt{z}}{E^{11}}(\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & b^\dagger \\ b & 0 \end{pmatrix} E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1) = \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{z}}{E^{11}}(\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & b^\dagger \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ b & 0 \end{pmatrix} E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1) = \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{z}}{E^{11}}(\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & b^\dagger \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1) = \\
&= 2\sqrt{z}Re(E^{b1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.17}$$

Inserting the expression for λ_1 into Eq. (A.16) gives that

(A.18)

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{z}E^{11}}(E^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & b^\dagger \\ b & 0 \end{pmatrix} E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1 - 2Re(E^{b1})E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1) = \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{z}E^{11}}(E^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & b^\dagger \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1 + E^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ b & 0 \end{pmatrix} E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1 - 2Re(E^{b1})E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1) = \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{z}E^{11}}(E^{b1}E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1 + E^{11}E^{-1}\hat{b} - 2Re(E^{b1})E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1) = \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{z}}\left(E^{-1}\hat{b} - \frac{\overline{E^{b1}}}{E^{11}}E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1\right).
\end{aligned}$$

The next $O(\epsilon^2)$ equation is

$$E^{-1}A_2 w_0 + E^{-1}A_1 w_1 + E^{-1}A_0 w_2 = \lambda_2 w_0 + \lambda_1 w_1 + \lambda_0 w_2. \tag{A.19}$$

Multiplying this equation by $\mathbf{e}_1^T$ and recalling that $A_0 w_2 = 0$ and that $\mathbf{e}_1^\dagger w_0 = E^{11}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_2 &= \frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}A_2 E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1}{E^{11}} + \frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}A_1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{z}}(E^{-1}\hat{b} - \frac{\overline{E^{b1}}}{E^{11}}E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1)}{E^{11}} = \\
&= \frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}A_2 E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1}{E^{11}} + \frac{E^{11}E^{bb} + (\overline{E^{b1}})^2 - 2\overline{E^{b1}}Re(E^{b1})}{E^{11}} = \\
&= \frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}A_2 E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1}{E^{11}} + \frac{E^{11}E^{bb} - E^{b1}\overline{E^{b1}}}{E^{11}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.20}$$

Combining Eqs. (A.15)-(A.20), we obtain the following approximate stochastic representation for the largest eigenvalue ℓ_1 of $E^{-1}H_\epsilon$

$$\ell_1(\epsilon) = zE^{11} + 2\epsilon\sqrt{z}Re(E^{b1}) + \epsilon^2\frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}A_2E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1}{E^{11}} + \epsilon^2\frac{E^{11}E^{bb} - E^{b1}\overline{E^{b1}}}{E^{11}} + o(\epsilon^2). \tag{A.21}$$

Next, to derive the approximate distribution of ℓ_1 corresponding to the above equation, we study a 2×2 Hermitian matrix S, whose inverse is defined by

$$S^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} E^{11} & \overline{E^{b1}} \\ E^{b1} & E^{bb} \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.22}$$

meaning $S^{-1} = M^\dagger E^{-1} M$, where the $m \times 2$ matrix $M = [\mathbf{e}_1, \hat{b}]$. Inverting this matrix gives

$$S = \frac{1}{E^{11}E^{bb} - E^{b1}\overline{E^{b1}}} \begin{pmatrix} E^{bb} & -E^{b1} \\ -\overline{E^{b1}} & E^{11}. \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.23}$$

Hence in terms of the matrix S and S^{-1}, Eq. (A.21) can be written as

$$\ell_1(\epsilon) = zS^{11} + 2\epsilon\sqrt{z}Re(E^{b1}) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{S_{22}} + \epsilon^2\frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}A_2E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1}{E^{11}} + o(\epsilon^2). \tag{A.24}$$

To establish Propositions 3 and 4, we start from Eq. (A.24). We neglect the second term $T_1 = 2\epsilon\sqrt{z}Re(E^{b1})$ which is symmetric with mean zero, and whose variance is much smaller than that of the first term. We also approximate the last term, denoted by T_2, by its mean value, using Lemma 3. We now have

$$\ell_1(\epsilon) \approx zS^{11} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{S_{22}} + \epsilon^2 c(m,n)$$

where $c(m,n)$ is the expectation from Lemma 3. Recall that (A.24) is the largest eigenvalue of $E^{-1}H_\epsilon = \epsilon^2 E^{-1}H$. We need to divide by ϵ^2 in order to get the eigenvalue of $E^{-1}H$. By doing so, and inserting the distributions of S^{11}, S_{22}, that are known from Lemma 2, we have

$$\ell_1(E^{-1}H) \approx \frac{2z}{\epsilon^2\chi^2_{2n_E-2m+2}} + \frac{2||b||^2}{\chi^2_{2n_E-2m+4}} + \frac{m-1}{(n_E-m)(n_E-m-1)}.$$

Next, by inserting the distributions of $||b||^2$, z and the relevant value of ϵ, we get that for Proposition 3

$$\ell_1(\lambda) \approx (1+\lambda)\frac{\chi^2_{2n_H}}{\chi^2_{2n_E-2m+2}} + \frac{\chi^2_{2m-2}}{\chi^2_{2n_E-2m+4}} + \frac{m-1}{(n_E-m)(n_E-m-1)}$$

and for Proposition 4

$$\ell_1(\omega) \approx \frac{\chi^2_{2n_H}(2\omega)}{\chi^2_{2n_E-2m+2}} + \frac{\chi^2_{2m-2}}{\chi^2_{2n_E-2m+4}} + \frac{m-1}{(n_E-m)(n_E-m-1)}.$$

Notice that from lemma 2 and the comment about the independency of u and z in the beginning of the proof, we get that all of the above χ^2 random variables are independent. At last, since ratios of independent χ^2 random variables follow a F distribution, the two propositions follow.

□

Proof of Prop. 5. Since ω depends through $X^\dagger X$, following (2.15), we invoke Proposition 4 with the re-parametrization $m = p, n_H = q$, and $n_E = n - q$ to obtain the approximate conditional distribution of l_1 as

$$\ell_1\left(E^{-1}H\right)|X \approx a_1 F_{b_1,c_1}\left(\frac{2\rho^2}{1-\rho^2}\left(X^\dagger X\right)_{11}\right) + a_2 F_{b_2,c_2} + a_3. \tag{A.25}$$

Since $\left(X^\dagger X\right)_{11} \sim \frac{1}{2}\chi^2_{2n}$, the final result follows by removing the condition by using the definition of $F^{\chi}_{a,b}(c,n)$ given in (2.18). □

Proof of Prop. 6 and 7. Let us assume w.l.o.g. that $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{e}_1$. Therefore, we can write (3.1) as

$$R = \frac{|\hat{\mathbf{v}}^\dagger \mathbf{e}_1|^2}{||\hat{\mathbf{v}}||^2}. \tag{A.26}$$

Moreover, following Lemma 1, we have

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}} = w_0 + \sigma w_1 + \sigma^3 w_3 + \cdots \tag{A.27}$$

where

$$w_0 = \mathbf{e}_1, \quad w_1 = \frac{1}{||u||}\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_3 = \frac{1}{||u||^3}\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sum_{j=2}^n v_j v_j^\dagger v_1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.28}$$

Here

$$u \sim \begin{cases} \mathcal{CN}(0,(\lambda+\sigma^2)I_n) & \text{for } H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, \lambda\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^{'} + \sigma^2 I_m) \\ \mathcal{CN}(\mu,\sigma^2 I_n) & \text{for } H \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, \sigma^2 I_m, (\omega/\sigma^2)\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^{'}) \end{cases} \tag{A.29}$$

and $v_j \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I_{m-1})$ are independent random vectors with $\omega = ||\mu||^2$. Therefore, we have

$$R = \frac{1}{1 + \sigma^2\frac{||v_1||^2}{||u||^2} + 2\sigma^4\frac{\sum_{j=2}^n |v_1^\dagger v_j|^2}{||u||^4} + \cdots}. \tag{A.30}$$

The final result follows by using the distributional arguments given in the proof of Propositions 1 and 2. □

B. Proof of the auxiliary lemmas

Proof of Lemma 1. Write the $m\times n$ matrix $X(\epsilon)=[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ and observe that $X(-\epsilon)=UX(\epsilon)$, where $U=diag(1,-1,\ldots,-1)$, is an orthogonal matrix. Thus, the matrix $H(-\epsilon)=U^TH(\epsilon)U$ has the same eigenvalues as $H(\epsilon)$. In particular, the largest eigenvalue ℓ_1 and its corresponding eigenvector v_1 satisfy

$$\ell_1(-\epsilon)=\ell_1(\epsilon),\qquad v_1(-\epsilon)=Uv_1(\epsilon). \tag{B.1}$$

Hence ℓ_1 and the first component of v_1 are even functions of ϵ whereas the remaining components of v_1 are odd. Denote the following matrices:

$$A_0=\begin{pmatrix} z & 0\\ 0 & 0_{m-1}\end{pmatrix},\qquad A_1=\sqrt{z}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & b^\dagger\\ b & 0_{m-1}\end{pmatrix},\qquad A_2=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0\\ 0 & Z\end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.2}$$

We decompose the matrix $H(\epsilon)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} H=\sum_{j=1}^n x_jx_j^\dagger &= \sum_{j=1}^n(u_j\mathbf{e}_1+\epsilon\xi_j^\perp)(u_j\mathbf{e}_1+\epsilon\xi_j^\perp)^\dagger\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n|u_j|^2\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^T+\epsilon\sum_{j=1}^n[\xi_j^\perp\cdot\overline{u_j}\mathbf{e}_1^T+u_j\mathbf{e}_1\cdot\xi_j^{\perp\dagger}]+\epsilon^2\sum_{j=1}^n\xi_j^\perp\cdot\xi_j^{\perp\dagger}\\ &= \begin{pmatrix} z & 0\\ 0 & 0_{n-1}\end{pmatrix}+\epsilon\sqrt{z}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & b^\dagger\\ b & 0_{n-1}\end{pmatrix}+\epsilon^2\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0\\ 0 & Z\end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

meaning

$$H(\epsilon)=A_0+\epsilon A_1+\epsilon^2A_2. \tag{B.3}$$

Since $H(\epsilon)$ is Hermitian for all ϵ, it follows that the largest eigenvalue $\ell_1(\epsilon)$ is real-valued. Furthermore, since $H(\epsilon)$ is an holomorphic symmetric function of ϵ, it follows from Kato ([25], Theorem 6.1, page 120) that the largest eigenvalue ℓ_1 and its eigenprojection $P(\epsilon)$ are analytic functions of ϵ, in some neighborhood of zero.

For $\epsilon=0$, $\mathbf{e}_1$ is an eigenvector with eigenvalue z, that is, $\langle P(0)\mathbf{e}_1,\mathbf{e}_1\rangle=\langle\mathbf{e}_1,\mathbf{e}_1\rangle=1$. Since P is an analytic function of ϵ and the inner product is a smooth function, the function $\langle P(\epsilon)\mathbf{e}_1,\mathbf{e}_1\rangle$ is a (real-valued) analytic function of ϵ and also strictly positive in some neighborhood of $\epsilon=0$. We may thus define

$$v_1(\epsilon)\ =\langle P(\epsilon)\mathbf{e}_1,\mathbf{e}_1\rangle^{-1}P(\epsilon)\mathbf{e}_1. \tag{B.4}$$

Clearly, v_1 is an eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue ℓ_1 and it is also analytic in some neighborhood of zero.

We may thus expand ℓ_1 and v_1 in a convergent Taylor series in ϵ. Eq. (B.1) implies that all odd coefficients vanish in the expansion for ℓ_1:

$$\ell_1=\lambda_0+\epsilon^2\lambda_2+\epsilon^4\lambda_4+\ldots$$

$$v_1 = w_0 + \epsilon w_1 + \epsilon^2 w_2 + \epsilon^3 w_3 + \epsilon^4 w_4 + \dots$$

Inserting this expansion into the eigenvalue equation $Hv_1 = \ell_1 v_1$ gives the following set of equations for $r \geq 0$

$$A_0 w_r + A_1 w_{r-1} + A_2 w_{r-2} = \lambda_0 w_r + \lambda_2 w_{r-2} + \lambda_4 w_{r-4} + \dots \tag{B.5}$$

with the convention that vectors with negative subscripts are zero. From the $r = 0$ equation, $A_0 w_0 = \lambda_0 w_0$, we readily find that

$$\lambda_0 = z, \qquad w_0 = const \cdot \mathbf{e}_1.$$

Using Eq. (B.4),

$$\langle v_1, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle = \langle \langle P(\epsilon)\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle^{-1} P(\epsilon)\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle = \langle P(\epsilon)\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle^{-1} \langle P(\epsilon)\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle = 1$$

and $w_0 = v_1(0) = \mathbf{e}_1$. This implies that w_j, for $j \geq 1$, is orthogonal to $\mathbf{e}_1$, that is orthogonal to w_0.

From the eigenvector remarks following (B.1) it follows that $w_{2j} = 0$ for $j \geq 1$. These remarks allow considerable simplification of equations (B.5); we use those for $r = 1$ and $r = 3$

$$A_1 w_0 = \lambda_0 w_1, \qquad A_2 w_1 = \lambda_0 w_3 + \lambda_2 w_1 \tag{B.6}$$

from which we obtain, by setting $\hat{b} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ b \end{pmatrix}$,

$$w_1 = z^{-1/2}\hat{b}, \qquad w_3 = \lambda_0^{-1}(A_2 - \lambda_2 I)w_1.$$

Multiply (B.5) on the left by w_0^H and use the first equation of (B.6) to get, for r even,

$$\lambda_r = (A_1 w_0)^\dagger w_{r-1} = \lambda_0 w_1^\dagger w_{r-1}$$

and hence

$$\lambda_2 = \lambda_0 w_1^\dagger w_1 = b^\dagger b$$
$$\lambda_4 = w_1^\dagger (A_2 - \lambda_2 I) w_1 = z^{-1} b^\dagger (Z - bb^\dagger) b.$$

□

To prove lemma 2 and 3, we require the following two claims, which are the complex analogies of two theorems from Muirhead ([26], page 93-96, theorems 3.2.8 and 3.2.11).

Claim 2. *Suppose $A \sim CW_m(n, \Sigma)$ where A and Σ are partitioned as follows*

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \qquad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

and let $A_{11\cdot 2} = A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}$, and let $\Sigma_{11\cdot 2} = \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\Sigma_{21}$. Then, $A_{11\cdot 2}$ is distributed as $\mathcal{CW}_k(n - m + k, \Sigma_{11\cdot 2})$ and is independent of A_{12}, A_{21} and A_{22}.

Proof. In the following change of variables $A_{11\cdot 2} = A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}$, $B_{12} = A_{12}$, $B_{22} = A_{22}$, the Jacobian matrix is an upper-diagonal matrix, where the diagonal entries are all one. Hence

$$(\mathrm{d}A) = (\mathrm{d}A_{11}) \wedge (\mathrm{dA}_{12}) \wedge (\mathrm{d}A_{22}) = (\mathrm{d}A_{11\cdot 2}) \wedge (\mathrm{d}B_{12}) \wedge (\mathrm{d}B_{22}).$$

We note that

$$\det A = \det A_{22} \det(A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}) = \det B_{22} \det A_{11\cdot 2}$$

and

$$\det \Sigma = \det \Sigma_{22} \det \Sigma_{11\cdot 2}.$$

Denote by $\Sigma^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & C_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Now,

$$\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}A) = \mathrm{tr}\left[\begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & C_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{11\cdot 2} + B_{12}B_{22}^{-1}B_{21} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{pmatrix}\right] =$$

$$\mathrm{tr}\left[C_{11}A_{11\cdot 2}\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{11}B_{12}B_{22}^{-1}B_{21}\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{12}B_{21}\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{21}B_{12}\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{22}B_{22}\right].$$

Using the above equation and the fact that $\mathrm{tr}(XY) = \mathrm{tr}(YX)$ and Σ^{-1}, A are self-adjoint, we get

$$\mathrm{tr}\left[C_{11}(B_{12} + C_{11}^{-1}C_{12}B_{22})B_{22}^{-1}(B_{12} + C_{11}^{-1}C_{12}B_{22})^{\dagger}\right] +$$

$$\mathrm{tr}\left[B_{22}(C_{22} - C_{21}C_{11}^{-1}C_{12})\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{11}A_{11\cdot 2}\right] =$$

$$= \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{11}B_{12}B_{22}^{-1}B_{21}\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{12}B_{21}\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{21}B_{12}\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{12}C_{11}^{-1}C_{21}B_{22}\right] +$$

$$+\mathrm{tr}\left[B_{22}C_{22}\right] - \mathrm{tr}\left[B_{22}C_{21}C_{11}^{-1}C_{12}\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[C_{11}A_{11\cdot 2}\right] = \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}A).$$

Using the relations $C_{11} = \Sigma_{11\cdot 2}^{-1}$, $C_{22} - C_{21}C_{11}^{-1}C_{12} = \Sigma_{22}^{-1}$ and $C_{11}^{-1}C_{12} = -\Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}$, we get

$$\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}A) = \mathrm{tr}\left[\Sigma_{11\cdot 2}^{-1}(B_{12} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}B_{22})B_{22}^{-1}(B_{12} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}B_{22})^{\dagger}\right] +$$

$$\mathrm{tr}\left[B_{22}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\right] + \mathrm{tr}\left[\Sigma_{11\cdot 2}^{-1}A_{11\cdot 2}\right].$$

Now, the we can present the joint density of A [27] as

$$p(A) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}\Gamma_m(n)(\det \Sigma)^n}\mathrm{etr}(-\Sigma^{-1}A)(\det A)^{n-m} =$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{etr}(-\Sigma_{11\cdot 2}^{-1}A_{11\cdot 2})(\det A_{11\cdot 2})^{n-m+k-k}}{\mathcal{C}\Gamma_k(n-m+k)\cdot(\det \Sigma_{11\cdot 2})^{n-m+k}} \cdot \frac{\mathrm{etr}(-\Sigma_{22}^{-1}B_{22})(\det B_{22})^{n-m+k}}{\mathcal{C}\Gamma_{m-k}(n)(\det \Sigma_{22})^n} \cdot$$

$$\cdot \frac{\mathcal{C}\Gamma_k(n-m+k)\cdot\mathcal{C}\Gamma_{m-k}(n)\cdot\mathrm{etr}(-\Sigma_{11\cdot 2}^{-1}(B_{12} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}B_{22})B_{22}^{-1}(B_{12} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}B_{22})^{\dagger})}{\mathcal{C}\Gamma_m(n)\cdot(\det \Sigma_{11\cdot 2})^{m-k}\cdot(\det B_{22})^k} \cdot$$

where $\mathcal{C}\Gamma_a(b) = \pi^{\frac{1}{2}a(a-1)}\Gamma(b)\cdots\Gamma(b-a+1)$.
By this decomposition of the density function, and by the note on the change of variables, we conclude that $A_{11\cdot 2}$ is distributed as $\mathcal{CW}_k(n-m+k, \Sigma_{11\cdot 2})$ and is independent of B_{12}, B_{21} and B_{22}, and also of A_{12}, A_{21} and A_{22}. □

Claim 3. *Let $A \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, \Sigma)$ and let M be a $k \times m$ matrix of rank k, where M is independent of A. Then $(MA^{-1}M^\dagger)^{-1} \sim \mathcal{CW}_k(n-m+k, (M\Sigma^{-1}M^\dagger)^{-1})$.*

Proof. Set $B = \Sigma^{-1/2}A\Sigma^{-1/2}$. Now $B \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, I)$. For $R = M\Sigma^{-1/2}$,

$$(MA^{-1}M^\dagger)^{-1} = (RB^{-1}R^\dagger)^{-1}$$

$$(M\Sigma^{-1}M^\dagger)^{-1} = (RR^\dagger)^{-1}$$

thus it is sufficient to prove that $(RB^{-1}R^\dagger)^{-1} \sim \mathcal{CW}_k(n-m+k, (RR^\dagger)^{-1})$. Let $R = L[I_k : 0]H$ be the SVD decomposition of R, where L is $k \times k$ and nonsingular and H is $m \times m$ unitary. Now,

$$(RB^{-1}R^\dagger)^{-1} = \left(L[I_k : 0]HB^{-1}H^\dagger[I_k : 0]'L^\dagger\right)^{-1} =$$

$$= (L^{-1})^\dagger \left([I_k : 0](HBH^\dagger)^{-1}[I_k : 0]'\right]\Big)^{-1} L^{-1} =$$

$$= (L^{-1})^\dagger \left([I_k : 0]C^{-1}[I_k : 0]'\right]\Big)^{-1} L^{-1}$$

where $C = HBH^\dagger \sim \mathcal{CW}_m(n, I)$. Let

$$D = C^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} D_{11} & D_{12} \\ D_{21} & D_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & C_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

where D_{11} and C_{11} are $k \times k$. Then $(RB^{-1}R^\dagger)^{-1} = (L^{-1})^\dagger D_{11}^{-1} L^{-1}$, and since $D_{11}^{-1} = C_{11} - C_{12}C_{22}^{-1}C_{21}$, it follows from Claim 2 that $D_{11}^{-1} \sim \mathcal{CW}_k(n-m+k, I_k)$. Hence $(L^{-1})^\dagger D_{11}^{-1} L^{-1} \sim \mathcal{CW}_k(n-m+k, (LL^\dagger)^{-1})$, and since $(LL^\dagger)^{-1} = (RR^\dagger)^{-1}$, the proof is complete.

□

Proof of Lemma 2. Note that $S^{11} = E^{11} = \mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1$. Then, according to Claim 3, $(S^{11})^{-1} \sim \mathcal{CW}_1(n-m+1, I_1) = \frac{\chi^2_{2n-2m+2}}{2}$, meaning $S^{11} \sim \frac{2}{\chi^2_{2n-2m+2}}$.
Next, by definition $S = (M^\dagger E^{-1} M)^{-1}$, with fixed M. Therefore, according to the same claim, $S \sim \mathcal{CW}_2(n-m+2, D)$, where $D = ([\mathbf{e}_1, b][\mathbf{e}_1, b]^\dagger)^{-1} = diag(1, \frac{1}{||b||^2})$. Therefore $S_{22} \sim \frac{\chi^2_{2n-2m+4}}{2||b||^2}$.
Finally, notice that $(S^{11})^{-1} = S_{11} - S_{12}S_{22}^{-1}S_{21}$, thus according to Claim 2, $(S^{11})^{-1}$ is independent of S_{22}, meaning S^{11} is independent of S_{22}.

□

Proof of Lemma 3. Since A_2 is independent of E, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[A_2|E] = \mathbb{E}[A_2] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{m-1}. \end{pmatrix}$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1} A_2 E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1}{E^{11}}\right] = \mathbb{E}_E\left[\mathbb{E}_{A|E}\left[\frac{\mathbf{e}_1^T E^{-1} A_2 E^{-1} \mathbf{e}_1}{E^{11}}\right]\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=2}^{m} \frac{||E^{1j}||^2}{E^{11}}\right] = (m-1)\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{||E^{12}||^2}{E^{11}}\right].$$

To compute this expectation, consider the matrix $S^{-1} = [\mathbf{e}_1\ e_2]^T E^{-1} [\mathbf{e}_1\ e_2] = \begin{pmatrix} E^{11} & E^{21} \\ \overline{E}^{21} & E^{22} \end{pmatrix}$.

Now, $S^{22} = E^{22}$ and $S_{22} = E^{11}/(E^{11}E^{22} - ||E^{12}||^2)$. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{S_{22}} = E^{22} - \frac{||E^{12}||^2}{E^{11}}. \tag{B.7}$$

We now take expectation of the above equation. As in the previous lemma, $S_{22} \sim \frac{1}{2}\chi^2_{2n-2m+4}$, whereas $E^{22} \sim \frac{2}{\chi^2_{2n-2m+2}}$. Using these results, we obtain

(B.8)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(E^{12})^2}{E^{11}}\right] = \mathbb{E}[E^{22}] - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{2}{\chi^2_{2n-2m+4}}\right] = \frac{2}{2n-2m} - \frac{2}{2n-2m+2} = \frac{1}{(n-m)(n-m+1)}$$

which completes the proof. □

References

[1] C. G. Khatri. Distribution of the largest or the smallest characteristic root under null hypothesis concerning complex multivariate normal populations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(4):1807-1810, 1964.

[2] C. G. Khatri. Non-central distributions of i th largest characteristic roots of three matrices concerning complex multivariate normal populations. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 21(1):23-32, 1969.

[3] M. Kang and M.-S. Alouini. Largest eigenvalue of complex Wishart matrices and performance analysis of MIMO MRC systems. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 21(3):418-426, Apr 2003.

[4] T. Ratnarajah, R. Vaillancourt, and M. Alvo. Eigenvalues and condition numbers of complex random matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 26(2):441-456, 2004.

[5] A. Zanella, M. Chiani, and M. Z. Win. On the marginal distribution of the eigenvalues of Wishart matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 57(4):1050-1060, April 2009.

[6] K. Johansson. Shape fluctuations and random matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 209(2):437-476, 2000.

[7] I. M. Johnstone. On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 29(2):295-327, 2001.

[8] I. M. Johnstone. Approximate null distribution of the largest root in multivariate analysis. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 3(4):1616-1633, 2009.

[9] Z. Ma. Accuracy of the Tracy-Widom limits for the extreme eigenvalues in white Wishart matrices. *Bernoulli*, 18(1):322-359, 2012.

[10] N. El Karoui. A rate of convergence result for the largest eigenvalue of complex white Wishart matrices. *The Annals of Probability*, 34(6):2077-2117, 2006.

[11] T. W. Anderson. *An introduction to multivariate statistical analysis*. Wiley, 3rd edition, 2003.

[12] D. Paul. Asymptotics of sample eigenstructure for a large dimensional spiked covariance model. *Statistica Sinica*, 17:1617-1642, 2007.

[13] R. Rao Nadakuditi and J. W. Silverstein. Fundamental limit of sample generalized eigenvalue based detection of signals in noise using relatively few signal-bearing and noise-only samples. *IEEE Journal Of Selected Topics In Signal Processing*, 4(3):468-480, June 2010.

[14] P. Dharmawansa, I. M. Johnstone, and A. Onatski. Local asymptotic normality of the spectrum of high-dimensional spiked F-ratios. *manuscript in preparation*, 2014.

[15] I. M. Johnstone and B. Nadler. Roys largest root test under rank-one alternatives. *arxiv.org/1310.6581*, 2013.

[16] B. Nadler. Finite sample approximation results for principal component analysis: A matrix perturbation approach. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2791-2817, 2008.

[17] H. L. Van Trees. *Optimal Array Processing*. Wiley, 2002.

[18] K. E. Wage and J. R. Buck. Snapshot performance of the dominant mode rejection beamformer. *IEEE journal of Oceanic Engineering*, 39(2):212-225, April 2014.

[19] S. Haykin. Cognitive radio: brain-empowered wireless communications. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 23:201-220, 2005.

[20] Y. Zeng, Y-C. Liang, A. T. Hoang, and R. Zhang. A review on spectrum sensing for cognitive radio: challenges and solutions. *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing*, 2010:2, 2010.

[21] Y. Zeng and Y.-C. Liang. Eigenvalue-based spectrum sensing algo- rithms for cognitive radio. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 57(6):1784-1793, June 2009.

[22] L. C. Zhao, P. R. Krishnaiah, and Z. D. Bai. On detection of the number of signals when the noise covariance matrix is arbitrary. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 20(1):26-49, 1986.

[23] S. Haykin and M. Moher. *Communication Systems*. 5th edition, Wiley, 2009.

[24] J. Hansen and H. Bölcskei. A geometrical investigation of the rank-1 Ricean MIMO channel at high SNR. In *International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, page 64, June 2004.

[25] T. Kato. *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*. Classics in Mathematics. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995.

[26] R. J. Muirhead. *Aspects of multivariate statistical theory*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2009.

[27] N. R. Goodman. Statistical analysis based on a certain multivariate complex Gaussian distribution (An introduction). *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 34(1):152-177, 1963.